BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Salasses Coppens et al Examiner Group Art Unit 1761 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Curtis E. Sherrer (3) Units Michaels (4)
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Curtis E. Sherrer (2) Timothy Levstik Janot Kauffil Date of Interview Aug 14, 2001 (5) Mus Norts Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy is given to 1] applicant 2] applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, but discussed: a proposed limitation clirected to the conhanced enzyme activity due to the use of activities o
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative) (1) Curtis E. Sherrer (2) Timothy Levstik James Kauffill Date of Interview Aug 14, 2001 (5) If is Noots Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal (copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative) Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes No. If yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, but discussed: a profoscillimitation clirected to The conhanced enzyme activity due to the use of cichivated spores V, clormant spores, Identification of prior art discussed: Gyllang et al.
(1) Curtis E. Sherrer (2) Timothy Levstik Jamon Kanggan Aug 14, 2001 (5) Mrus Machal (5) Mrus Noots Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, but discussed: a property of a fixed section of prior art discussed: (3) Yhrus Michael (4) Peu Dulu (5) Mrus Noots Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, but discussed a proposed limitation clirected to the configuration of prior art discussed: Gyllang et al.
(2) Timothy Levstik Samon Kauegra, Aug 14, 2001
Date of Interview Aug 14, 2001 Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, but discussed: A profosed limitation clirected to the confanced enzyme activity clue to the use of cichi afect spores v. dormant spores, Identification of prior art discussed: Gyllang et al.
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, but discussed: a stoposed limitation chrecked to the configuration of prior art discussed: Gyllang et al.
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) \(\text{Yes} \) \(\text{Personal [copy is given to 1]} \) \(\text{Personal [copy is given to 1]} \) \(\text{Yes} \) \(\text{e} \) \(\text{No. If yes, brief description:} \) \(\text{Claim(s) discussed:} \(\text{All claims in general, but discussed:} \) \(\tex
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) \(\text{Yes} \) \(\text{Personal [copy is given to 1]} \) \(\text{Personal [copy is given to 1]} \) \(\text{Yes} \) \(\text{e} \) \(\text{No. If yes, brief description:} \) \(\text{Claim(s) discussed:} \(\text{All claims in general, but discussed:} \) \(\tex
Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, but discussed a Arofosed limitation chrected to the enhanced enzyme activity due to the use of activities spores V. charmant spores, Identification of prior art discussed: Gyllang et al.
Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, but discussed a Arofosed limitation chrected to the enhanced enzyme activity due to the use of activities spores v. chormant spores, Identification of prior art discussed: Gyllang et al.
Gyllang et al.
Gyllang et al.
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.
Agreement with respect to the claims fill was reached. gill was not reached. hill N/A.
bstance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or
other comments:
Applicants will consider amending the claims to include an oper limit of
the claims to overcome the Ita an fly rejection will consider emending
will overcome the deposit requirements. Applicants will submit articles
showing the enablement of activation and germination of the claimed
spores I Examiner agreed that an organism That is apposited is enabled
the claim? Applicants will arg se the 103 rejection. Applicants will engine
submitting evidence that Gyllang's process provides no more enzymatic activity
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims
allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)
i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE
SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached
than using dormant spores, Nothing promised.
(it has been a second
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. CURTIS E. SHERRER PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 1761

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-413 (Rev. 03-98)

ART UNIT 1761